HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Successful answers are dependent upon candidates reading the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are focused and relevant.

When a question asks 'why' a particular event happened it is important that candidates direct their response to address and explain the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened.

General comments

Candidates continue to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions. Many candidates communicate their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. There were few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

Part (a) answers should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. It was pleasing to see that most candidates realised that answers to **(a)** questions can be short and concise and that there is no need to include background information.

Parts (b) and (c) of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events, rather than using a purely narrative or 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'Why' a particular event happened so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than provide a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, usually using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative or long introductions are not required. .

In **Part (c)** candidates need to argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful', depending on the question set. Less successful responses often focused on one side of the argument only and these responses could have been improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced and stronger answer.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2 and 3

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 4

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. Good answers showed understanding of the events that took place in July 1914 after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife. Most were able to describe the ultimatum that Austria sent to Serbia with the 48-hour deadline and identified that although Serbia accepted most of Austria's demands, relations were broken off by Austria and on 28 July Austria declared war on Serbia. Weaker responses were characterised by lengthy descriptions of the events of the assassination.

bestexamhelp.com

© 2019

(b) This question was well answered and most candidates understood the term 'Dreadnoughts' and were able to explain why they were important to relations between Britain and Germany. Most identified that the launch of the super-battleship 'Dreadnought' by Britain in 1906 marked the start of the naval race between Britain and Germany**.** They then used supporting evidence to explain the impact of these Dreadnoughts.

(c) This question produced many one-sided answers. Although candidates could describe the Moroccan Crises of 1905 and 1911, they were less confident about making clear links to the threat to peace in Europe and could not provide convincing arguments to prove that the Moroccan Crises were a threat to peace in Europe. Most candidates could identify at least one other threat to peace at this time, usually the Alliance System, the arms race or the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Supporting evidence was then included to explain these other factors. Less successful responses tended to be very generalised and to be improved these answers needed to include secure contextual knowledge.

Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most widely-answered questions in the Core Content section

Question 5

(a) Most candidates had a good understanding of the dispute over the Aaland islands and provided brief and relevant details, such as 'The Aaland Island dispute was between Sweden and Finland', 'The League of Nations investigated the matter' and the 'League ruled in favour of Finland'. Candidates could have stated that most islanders wanted to be ruled by Sweden but Sweden accepted the judgement. A small number of candidates stated the wrong countries being involved.

(b) Two well explained reasons were needed in response to this question. Successful responses identified an agency and then explained the work done by it to show why it was important. A popular example quoted by the candidates was the Health Committee, explaining how it worked hard to defeat leprosy and reduce the cases of malaria and yellow fever, the latter two by starting an international campaign against mosquitoes. It was also successful in dealing with cholera, smallpox and dysentery in Turkish refugee camps. Other well explained agencies included the work of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Slavery Commission and Mandates Commission. Other responses included less relevant, generalised information about the League of Nations, often including lengthy details on the role of the Assembly, Council and Secretariat which were not relevant to this question.

(c) Candidates needed to produce a well- balanced answer explaining how the structure of the League and the Great Depression caused the weakness of the League and then assess which out of the two reasons was the most important. Many candidates were able to identify weaknesses in the structure of the League, including the Assembly and Council not meeting often, that the votes had to be unanimous, a veto could be used in Council and not all nations were members. Successful responses then included contextual examples, such as Vilna, Manchuria or Abyssinia to explain the problems caused by the structure. For example, many stronger responses identified that the USA not joining the League was a serious blow as the League needed the USA's military might and ability to make economic sanctions effective. Supporting evidence usually included a contextual example to emphasise the point, that if the USA had been a member, it could have used its Pacific forces to make Japan comply with the League of Nations in the Manchurian crisis or economic sanctions would have been no use as the USA would continue to trade with Japan. The importance of the Great Depression to the weakness of the League was less convincing, as a good number of candidates gave lengthy descriptions of the Depression and its effects, especially in Europe, but they drifted from the focus of the question and neglected to link their points to the weakness of the League. Some candidates did not mention the League at all. Successful responses explained how the Great Depression had political consequences with the growth of extremist parties who did not believe in democracy or international cooperation and acted in their own interests, which put great strains on the League.

Question 6

(a) This question worked well for most candidates who understood the changing relationship between Italy and Germany in the 1930s, particularly with reference to Austria. Italy's frustration of Hitler's ambitions in 1934 and inaction in 1938 featured in successful responses, some of which also

© 2019

included references to the dictators' common ideology, their fighting a common cause in the Spanish Civil War and the forging of the Rome-Berlin Axis and the Anti-Comintern Pact. Weaker responses were characterised by general comments on Hitler and Mussolini's actions; these answers would have been improved by making links to how these affected their relationship in the 1930s.

(b) Good understanding was often shown of one reason for the increase of militarism in Japan in the 1930s. Most candidates were able to explain the impact of the Great Depression on Japan and its consequent search for markets and a more dominant position in the Far East, an explanation which would allow them to achieve high marks on this question. These answers concentrated on the invasion of Manchuria as a cause of growing militarism. Fewer candidates were able to develop a second argument but the strongest responses did refer to Japan's anxieties over the intentions of and the potential threat from Soviet Russia and the USA in the Far East and the Pacific. Stronger responses also commented on the domestic situation in Japan in which the military came to political prominence. Weaker responses, whilst giving an initially good explanation linking the Great Depression to the search for raw materials and the subsequent growth of militarism through the invasion of Manchuria, concentrated exclusively on a description of the events Manchurian crisis, which made it difficult for them to achieve higher marks.

(c) Most candidates were able to explain the other factors leading to the outbreak of war in 1939, notably the counter-productive effects of appeasement and Hitler's exploitation of Germany's deep-seated hostility towards the Versailles settlement at the end of the First World War. Explanations on the other side of the argument (Hitler's desire to defeat communism) were less convincing and weaker responses concentrated solely on Hitler's actions against communist opponents inside Germany with no link to the outbreak of war in 1939. Others included information on why the Nazi Soviet Pact was beneficial to both Germany and the Soviet Union, which lacked relevance. The strongest answers were able to make valid points (supported by good explanations) about the importance of Hitler's anti-communism, firstly by illustrating its strength and intensity with reference to the views expressed in Mein Kampf, and secondly, linking these views to the anti-communist aspects of his foreign policy before 1939, including his involvement in the Spanish Civil War and participation in the Anti-Comintern Pact.

Question 7

(a) This question was well answered by many candidates who had a good understanding of MacArthur's role in the Korean War. Four accurate factual details were provided by many, including details such as his being commander of the UN forces and that he advanced into North Korea in October 1950. Candidates could also describe how he was forced to retreat after attack by the Chinese forces and how he was removed from power by President Truman for his refusal to follow orders. Some candidates confused North and South Korea and a few weaker responses included descriptions of the events of the war without mentioning MacArthur.

(b) Good understanding was shown of at least one reason why Chinese support for North Korea was important. The most common reason explained was that China was communist like North Korea and they did not want them to fall to the capitalists, therefore they provided armies and weapons to help the North Koreans push the UN army out of North Korea. Some candidates encountered challenges explaining a second reason, although some good answers were seen which discussed the impact of the UN forces, underestimating the strength of the Chinese forces, allowing the Chinese troops to launch devastating attacks against the UN and South Korean forces, thus driving UN forces out of North Korea.

(c) There were a number of well developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates assessing the success of the USA in the Korean War. Most candidates agreed that the Korean War had been a success for the USA because their reason for entering the war had been containment and their actions had shown that they had the will and means to contain communism. They had provided half of the ground forces and most of the air and naval forces. As a result of their efforts South Korea had remained capitalist, thus their policy of containment looked strong as they had managed to stop the spread of communism. Weaker responses were one-sided and did not provide convincing arguments regarding the limitations of the US policy in Korea. These responses were often characterised by lengthy descriptions of the events of the Korean War, with no assessment as to the success of the USA.

© 2019

Question 8

(a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of Imre Nagy's role in the Hungarian uprising. Many candidates provided four accurate features of his role, including that he was Prime Minister at the time of the rising, he wanted a Hungarian form of Socialism and, on 1 November 1956, announced that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact.

(b) Good understanding was shown of at least one reason why Gorbachev's reforms were important for Eastern Europe. The most common reason explained was that Gorbachev's own beliefs were much more open than those of his predecessors and he believed in more open social and democratic policies based around his policies of 'Glasnost' and 'Perestroika'. This meant that communist governments in Eastern Europe would no longer be dominated by the Soviet Union and the Red Army would no longer support communist governments, therefore the people of Eastern Europe could decide on their own system of government. Other responses wrote about Gorbachev's aims but needed to go on and make reference to their importance for Eastern Europe, which was the focus of the question.

(c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates explaining the ways in which the Soviets kept control of Europe between 1960 and 1980, notably the way in which they put down the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and how they built the Berlin Wall in 1961 to stop people defecting to the west. The strongest responses then explained that although the Soviets were in control of Eastern Europe in this period, their position was not secure as many people did not like communist policies and saw that there were better opportunities for people in the west. It is important that candidates read the dates in the question as a number of candidates wrote about events outside the time band, for example the Hungarian uprising and the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies

(a) The majority of candidates performed well on this question as they understood the term 'November Criminals' and were able to make references to the perceived betrayal of Germany, the 'stab in the back' and the year to which the term applies. Links to Ebert and his socialist government also gained credit, as did reference to Hitler's use and exploitation of the phrase. A few candidates were not familiar with the term, often identifying the Allied powers or communists.

(b) Many very good responses contained two detailed explanations of why there was left-wing opposition to the Weimar Republic. Most candidates were aware of the Spartacists and of the influence of the Bolsheviks' success in Russia in late 1917, as well as the chaotic situation in Germany 1918–1919. Many cited German unhappiness with the armistice of November and with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, which fed support for both left and right wing groups. The urge for strong and decisive government rather than the uncertainties of a new democratic system was often cited and explained. Some stronger responses also explained left wing activity beyond the Spartacist failure of 1919, usually referring to Bavaria in 1919 and again in 1923. Weaker responses, although often referring accurately to the causes of discontent in post war Germany, were characterised by confusion between the left and right opponents of the government. They assumed that its left-wing opponents were nationalists who wished to restore the Kaiser. Others included details on the events of the Spartacist rebellion, which lacked relevance.

(c) The strongest responses to this question came from candidates who had a good understanding of the weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution. Such responses explained the problems caused by a multi-party system operating under proportional representation, notably the turnover in coalition governments and of the effect of the use of Article 48, especially in the period 1930–1933. These responses also included details on other reasons as to why the Weimar Republic failed, often including the impact of the Great Depression on the economy, especially the growth in

© 2019

unemployment which led to the increase in support of the Nazis. A few explained the damaging impact of the rivalry between Von Papen and Von Schleicher. Candidates could also gain credit for good explanations explaining why the Weimar Republic was not necessarily doomed to failure and wrote clearly about economic recovery in the 1920s as a result of the impact of the Dawes Plan and the cultural achievements of Weimar. A common misconception in weaker responses was the confusion between the Weimar Constitution and the Weimar Government; in most of these cases the word 'constitution' was used to mean 'government'. Nearly all of these answers did not consider proportional representation and Article 48, and instead wrote about the successes and failures of the Weimar Government, including (and often concentrating on) the troubled period of 1919–1924 which was more difficult to link to the fate of the Republic.

Question 12

(a) Many candidates struggled with their knowledge of the Four-Year Plan. The most common misconception was that it was a plan to rebuild Germany after World War I. Successful responses noted that the plan was introduced in 1936, to ensure that the German forces were ready for war, Goering was in charge and priority was given to rearmament.

(b) This question was well answered and successful responses showed good understanding of two reasons why some people were unhappy with the changes the Nazis made to the economy, with most identifying and then explaining the effect of the changes on women and Jewish business owners. Others wrote effectively on the impact on workers of the removal of trade unions resulting in workers being unable to express their discontent over pay and conditions.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, with many responses being one-sided. Candidates wrote confidently about German economic preparations for war in the mid/late 1930s, explaining policies such as autarky, conscription and massive rearmament. Many candidates encountered challenges explaining the other side of the hypothesis, although some good answers were seen linking the Allied air raids to damage caused to German factories and production, resulting in German civilians facing greater hardship from 1941 onwards.

Question 13

(a) Candidates were familiar with the state of the Russian economy by 1914 and performed well on this question. Most candidates were able to identify four features of the economy including that around 80 per cent of Russians were peasants who had small farms which were not very productive and that there was some industry in Russia at this time, as oil and coal were being produced.

(b) Good understanding was shown by the candidates of the limited impact of the October Manifesto on the way Russia was ruled. The most common reason identified and explained was that the Tsar did not allow the Dumas to operate properly. In the 1905 October Manifesto the Tsar had offered the people of Russia a Duma, the right to free speech and the right to form political parties, however the Tsar continued to rule without taking any serious notice of them and dismissed the first two very quickly. He had issued the Fundamental Laws in 1906 which agreed to the existence of the Duma but put so many limitations on its powers that it could do virtually nothing. Weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons, for example, 'the Tsar dismissed the Dumas', but with no supporting evidence.

(c) There were many good, well-balanced responses which explained why Nicholas II was responsible for his own downfall, most notably because he put himself in control of the army in August 1915 which made him responsible for the military defeats and deaths of millions of Russians. Strong responses then explained other reasons for his downfall, including the poor state of the Russian economy, which by 1917 had led to food shortages resulting in violent protests. Less successful responses were characterised by description of Rasputin's character and his relationship with the Tsarina, and would have benefited from making links to the downfall of Nicholas II

Question 14

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

Question 15

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. The majority of candidates knew that there was a 'quota system' and that 'immigration was limited'. Some responses could have been improved by giving details of the immigration acts in the 1920s, such as their titles, dates, quota figures and origins of immigrants. Other responses focused on giving reasons why people immigrated to America in the 1920s, which was not the focus of the question.

(b) This question was well-answered and the responses showed that many candidates had a good understanding of why prohibition led to an increase in crime. Most candidates were able to explain two reasons, including that there were not enough law enforcing agents and that often the police 'turned a blind eye' to the illegal activities of the gangsters because they had accepted bribes. Weaker responses included generalised details about prohibition, such as why prohibition was introduced, which was not relevant to this question.

(c) Successful responses were characterised by at least two well explained arguments on both sides of the debate. Most candidates found much evidence to explain how women's lives changed in the 1920s. The strongest responses explained what life was like for women before the 1920s and then showed the changes such as 'women getting the vote in all states in 1920' and 'more women employed in offices and manufacturing'. The most popular changes explained were to their dress and habits when they went out to socialise. Stronger responses were able to counter the argument by explaining that not all women were affected by the changes, especially those in rural areas who saw little change or improvement in their lives. Weaker responses tended to be one sided and a list of things that women could now do, including 'go the cinema'. These responses could have been improved by the inclusion of more supporting detail.

Questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.
.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are focused and relevant. It is important that candidates note the particular focus of any given question, and structure the answer accordingly. Some candidates wrote about the topic given in the question at considerable length, but without any focused consideration on the particular requirements of the question. It is also important that dates given in a question are noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

In **part (c)** questions, the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond restating what has already been written earlier in the response by addressing, for example, 'how far', 'how important', 'how successful' or 'to what extent', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

A significant number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, did not always use their knowledge effectively to answer the particular question set. **Parts (b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but they needed to go on and develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers, candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers to these questions. Candidates need to ensure that they use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make; some candidates set out a clear argument and needed then to support this argument with relevant factual knowledge.

There were a very small number of rubric errors; some candidates answered fewer than the required number of questions, and some answered three part questions, rather than the required three questions, each with three parts. On the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with most completing the paper. There were a few candidates who wrote extended answers to a **part (a)** questions when this was not required.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2 and 3

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

Question 4

(a) Some candidates were able to give relevant points detailing Russia's role in the outbreak of the First World War. Relevant points made included Russia being part of the Alliance System, Russia having the largest army and Russia being the first to mobilise its troops.

(b) Some candidates gave an explanation focused upon the Serbian nationalist cause being a reason why Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated. Many responses to this question were narrative in approach, describing in some depth the events of the day when Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated. Answers to **part (b)** questions always require explanation.

(c) Candidates were able to identify a number of threats to peace in Europe in the years before 1914; the Alliance System, colonial rivalry, the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and the Balkan crises were all identified. These identifications needed to be developed into explanations, demonstrating clearly why they were a threat to peace. Some candidates explained why the naval race was a threat to peace in the years before 1914, citing the desire of Germany to build a navy to challenge that of Britain, and the ensuing race to build increasing numbers of Dreadnoughts.

Question 5

(a) There were many effective answers to this question, with candidates giving four concisely expressed and focused details describing how Hungary was treated in the peace settlement. Relevant points made included details of the various territorial losses, the restrictions placed upon the various parts of the Hungarian armed forces and the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Some candidates wrote about the Treaty of Versailles with Germany, rather than the Treaty of Trianon with Hungary. A few candidates wrote in generalised terms only, and did not give details which were specific to Hungary.

(b) There were some well-explained answers to this question, with a clear focus on the question. Explanations included why reparations caused economic problems for Germany up to 1923, coupled with the loss of important industrial areas. Some candidates also explained how the restrictions placed on the armed forces led to unemployment and the ensuing economic problems. Some candidates listed terms of the Treaty of Versailles which caused economic problems; these needed to be developed into explanations.

(c) Effective answers to this question clearly identified an aim of one of the Big Three and then explained how this aim was or was not achieved with reference to a specific treaty within the Paris peace talks. Explanations were given on both sides of the argument, and for each of the Big Three. A number of candidates wrote two disconnected paragraphs, one listing the aims of the Big Three collectively or individually, and then another paragraph listing terms of the various peace treaties, with the main focus being on Versailles. Candidates need to ensure that their answers clearly address the question asked.

Question 6

(a) There were a number of effective answers to this question, with candidates giving at least four clearly expressed and relevant points. Relevant points included the League officials going to assess the situation, the number of officials involved and the duration of their stay, the length of time taken to compile a report, the issuing of the Lytton Report and its recommendations, together with the League voting in favour of the report. The question asked for the League's responses to the invasion of Manchuria; some answers detailed why there was an invasion and the events of the invasion, rather than focusing upon the League's response.

(b) A number of relevant points were identified in response to this question. These included Britain and France viewing Mussolini as an ally against Germany, the concern that certain economic sanctions could affect the jobs of workers in Britain and the desire to avoid a war. Some candidates developed these identified points into clear explanations. A few candidates explained why Italy decided to occupy Abyssinia; this was not relevant to this question**.** A small number of candidates wrote about events in Corfu rather than Abyssinia, as the question required.

(c) Some candidates wrote answers in disagreement with the question hypothesis, explaining that the Disarmament Conference failed primarily because the main powers simply could not agree upon the extent and nature of disarmament to be carried out. Other explanations focused upon the

© 2019

reluctance to disarm as this would cause unemployment. Agreement with the question hypothesis tended to be more descriptive in nature. Some candidates wrote about Germany leaving the League of Nations, rather than leaving the Disarmament Conference; others wrote about the Treaty of Versailles as though it was the Disarmament Conference of the 1930s. Some responses would have been improved by an awareness of the chronology of the Disarmament Conference; some candidates gave explanations based upon events taking place after the Disarmament Conference had ended.

Question 7

(a) Effective answers to this question gave four concisely expressed points, highlighting, for example, that Operation Rolling Thunder was a bombing campaign carried out by the US, that it took place between March 1965 and November 1968, that its purpose included preventing men and supplies from the North reaching the South and that it intended to destroy transport systems and industrial bases in the North. Some responses included details of the tactics used by the Vietcong against the Americans; these details lacked relevance to the question.

(b) There were a number of effective explanations given in response to this question. Explanations focused upon the Vietcong's use of guerrilla tactics and how this helped them to withstand attacks by US forces, the support given by local people to the Vietcong and the Vietcong's use of an extensive network of underground tunnels and bunkers. Some candidates identified a number of relevant points; these needed to be developed into explanations.

(c) There were some well-developed answers to this question, with clear explanations on both sides of the argument. In agreement with the question hypothesis, explanations were given detailing how the American public were horrified at the scenes shown on television coverage of the Vietnam War. These included the My Lai massacre and the use of napalm and Agent Orange. On the other side of the argument, explanations were focused upon the huge cost of the war, the government reaction to peaceful protest against the war, the number of American soldiers killed, injured and returning home addicted to drugs, and also the impact on the mental health of soldiers. Some responses were very detailed, but adopted a narrative approach; these responses needed to use this detailed contextual knowledge to explain why the US public turned against the war.

Question 8

(a) A number of responses detailed at least four relevant points, including Gorbachev's introduction of Glasnost and Perestroika, his statement that the Red Army would not intervene to support Communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern European countries. Some responses made no reference to Eastern Europe at all, and focused solely upon events in the USSR.

(b) Responses included relevant identifications such as the Brezhnev Doctrine being a response to the Prague Spring and Dubcek's desire to introduce reforms, and a policy to demonstrate to other Eastern European countries that the USSR would not tolerate any rebellion against socialist principles. These identifications needed to be developed into explanations. Some responses were generalised statements only; some responses would have benefited from an awareness of what the Brezhnev Doctrine was, and why it was introduced.

(c) Effective responses to this question took careful note of the dates given in the question, and constructed clear explanations on both sides of the argument. In agreement with the question hypothesis, clear explanations were given of the Soviet response to events in Hungary in 1956, thus showing that Soviet control was secure. Explanation was also given of the construction of the Berlin Wall to prevent people migrating to the West. In disagreement with the question hypothesis, explanations were given demonstrating that Soviet control was not secure; explanations were focused upon Marshall Tito resisting Soviet control in Yugoslavia, the attempts made by people in some Eastern European countries to resist Soviet control, and the fact that the Berlin Wall had to be built showing that control was not secure. A number of responses missed the dates in the question, and wrote about events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and events in Poland in the 1980s. Others wrote about events in Vietnam and the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis, which are not relevant to a question about Soviet control in Eastern Europe.

© 2019

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Some responses gave at least two relevant points, focused primarily upon large numbers of men volunteering for the armed forces, and the BEF being sent to France. Many responses did not focus on the requirements of the question, and, rather than describing Britain's reaction to the outbreak of the war, wrote instead about events later on in the war.

(b) Effective responses to this question explained the importance of the Schlieffen Plan in trying to avoid a war on two fronts, and its importance in needing to ensure a quick defeat of France. Many answers identified points only; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations. Some responses described the details of the Schlieffen Plan at some length, rather than explaining its importance to Germany.

(c) A small number of candidates gave one explanation in agreement with the question hypothesis, detailing how the Schlieffen Plan was ultimately abandoned and the ensuing stalemate. Many responses to this question concentrated on describing what stalemate actually was, rather than addressing the issue in the question.

Question 10

(a) A number of candidates were able to give at least two relevant points in response to this question. Details given included the shortage of food, and the details of food being rationed such as sugar, butter and meat. Some candidates also mentioned the shortage of workers in industry and agriculture due to conscription.

(b) Some candidates gave one clear explanation, focused upon the huge number of casualties meaning that more men were needed to fight, coupled with the fact that fewer men were volunteering for service. Most responses included at least two valid identifications, stating that men no longer wanted to volunteer to fight, that huge numbers of casualties in battle meant many more men were needed, and that war was no longer viewed as an exciting adventure for which men wished to volunteer.

(c) Effective responses to this question explained how Germany could be viewed as being successful in the war at sea by detailing the number of ships sunk and casualties inflicted upon the British at the Battle of Jutland, when compared to German casualties and ships sunk. On the other side of the argument, explanation was focused upon British success in keeping control of the North Sea and imposing a naval blockade upon Germany. Some responses to this question were generalised statements which would have been improved by better knowledge and understanding of the war at sea, and the relative success of each country.

Question 11

(a) A significant number of candidates were able to give at least four clear and concisely expressed relevant points in responses to this question. Relevant points made included the number of women left as widows, the number of children left fatherless, the humiliation of defeat, the shortage of food, the reduction in national income, the fall in the standard of living, deaths in the influenza epidemic and the breakdown of law and order. A small number of responses were generalised in nature, mostly stating that the German civilians were unhappy.

(b) There were some effective responses to this question, with clear explanations of the reasons for right-wing opposition. Explanations were focused upon the right-wing hatred of the Treaty of Versailles and the Weimar Republic's association with the treaty, the right-wing desire to return to a Germany ruled in the same way as the Kaiser had ruled, and right-wing opposition to social change in Germany under the Weimar Republic. Many candidates were able to give at least two relevant identifications in response to this question; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations. Some responses gave lengthy descriptions of the Kapp Putsch, rather than explaining why there was right-wing opposition. Some candidates wrote about left-wing opposition, rather than right-wing.

© 2019

(c) Effective responses to this question clearly linked commentary on Stresemann's leadership to the survival of the Weimar Republic on one side of the argument, and explained how Stresemann's leadership was not the most important reason in Weimar's survival on the other side of the argument. Explanations related to the economy, Weimar gaining international credibility and being admitted to the League of Nations were all linked explicitly to the question to explain how Stresemann's leadership was the most important reason for the survival of the Weimar Republic. On the other side of the argument, explanations were given of how some of Stresemann's apparent achievements, such as negotiating loans with the USA, ultimately did not ensure the survival of the Weimar Republic. A number of responses showed a very detailed knowledge of Stresemann's leadership and wrote at length about what he did, but without any explicit reference to the actual survival of the Weimar Republic.

Question 12

(a) Some candidates were able to give at least two relevant points in answer to this question; these usually included that Jews were forbidden to marry or have sex with pure-blooded Germans and that Jews were denied German citizenship. A significant number of responses wrote about all the various actions taken against the Jews in Nazi Germany, rather than looking specifically at the impact of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935.

(b) Some candidates explained that the New Plan was introduced by Schacht in 1934 to deal with Germany's balance of trade deficit. Some candidates identified that the New Plan would enable Germany to buy raw materials from abroad, and would enable Germany to rearm. A significant number of candidates wrote about the Nazi economy throughout the time the Nazis were in power, with some writing at great length about the Beauty of Labour and Strength through Joy programmes. These points lacked relevance to a question about one specific aspect of the economy – Schacht's New Plan of 1934.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained agreement with the question hypothesis by considering the support for Hitler due to the promises he had made regarding the Treaty of Versailles and his economic policies, and also explained there was little opposition because people in Germany were simply too scared to oppose the Nazi regime. On the other side of the argument, explanations focused upon reasons for opposition to the Nazi regime, with explanations focused upon opposition from the members of the Church and from groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates. Candidates often demonstrated a depth of contextual knowledge, but this could have been used more effectively by some to answer the question set. Some responses described support and/or opposition, rather than explaining with explicit links to the question.

Question 13

(a) Some candidates were able to state at least two relevant points in responses to this question. Relevant points usually included that Kerensky was the Minister of War, and that he took over as Prime Minister after the July Days. A significant number of responses were generalised in nature, stating only that Kerensky had an important role in 1917.

(b) There were some effective responses to this question, with explanation of peace being important because it was clear that Russia was losing the war, coupled with the effects the continuation of the war was having at home. The Bolshevik promise of bread was also explained, with clear reference made to the food shortages in Russia. The Bolshevik promise of land tended to be described, rather than explained. A small number of answers just repeated the question.

(c) Some responses explained clearly the role of Trotsky in the success of the Bolsheviks in October 1917, focusing upon Trotsky's role in the planning and execution of the insurrection. Arguments in agreement with the question hypothesis were stronger than those in disagreement. Arguments disagreeing with the question hypothesis tended to identify points, such as Lenin being an opportunist and Lenin knowing when the time was right for action; these points needed to be developed into explanations.

Question 14

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

Question 15

(a) A number of candidates were able to state at least four distinct relevant points describing the state of the US economy in 1919. Relevant points included the US dominance of the chemical industry, US exports being double the value of imports, the introduction of new materials and also the introduction of new methods of production. A number of candidates wrote about the US economy in the mid-1920s and after the Wall Street Crash; these points lacked relevance to a question asking about the US economy in 1919.

(b) There were a number of highly effective answers to this question, with clear explanations of the car industry growing rapidly due to the moving assembly line and its effects on the speed of production of cars, the ensuing reduction in price meaning more people could afford cars, and also the contributions of the system of hire purchase and advertising to growth. Some responses, whilst being very detailed, described the effects of increased car production on other industries, rather than explaining why the car industry itself grew rapidly in the 1920s. Other responses described the process of mass production, but did not explain why this meant the car industry grew rapidly in the 1920s.

(c) Arguments in disagreement with the question hypothesis were, on the whole, clearer and more effective than those in agreement. Arguments in disagreement with the question hypothesis focused upon the problems facing farmers, the difficulties facing workers in traditional industries such as coal and textiles, and the reasons why so many black Americans found it difficult to find good jobs. Where explanation in agreement with the question hypothesis was given, it focused upon there being a boom which meant there were plenty of jobs in consumer goods industries. Some candidates wrote in detail about mass production but missed the required focus on the issue in the question.

Question 16

(a) A number of candidates gave at least four relevant and concisely expressed points. These included Long's belief that the New Deal did not do enough to help the poor, his proposal for a 'Share our Wealth' scheme, his proposal that personal fortunes over a certain level should be confiscated and the money shared out, and his promises of a minimum wage, and pensions for everyone over 60. Some responses wrote about Father Townsend and/or Father Coughlin, rather than Huey Long.

(b) A number of candidates gave two clearly expressed explanations in response to this question. Explanations focused upon the Republicans opposing the New Deal because they believed parts of it were unconstitutional, their opposition due to higher taxes, their resentment at government interference in business, and the belief that too much help would make people far too dependent on help from the government. Some response identified a number of valid points; these needed to be developed into explanations.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained how legislation in the Second New Deal such as the Wagner Act, the Resettlement Administration, the Social Security Act and the Farm Security Administration all helped to create a fairer society. On the other side of the argument, explanations were focused on the Social Security Act failing to help all sections of society, and upon the Second New Deal failing to create a fairer society as it did not tackle the gender wage gap or discrimination against black Americans. Some responses were very detailed, but were focused upon the First New Deal, which was not relevant to this question.

Question 17

(a) A small number of candidates were able to state two relevant points in response to this question, usually focused upon education being improved, and the development of new transport and communication links. A number of candidates wrote about Chiang Kai-shek generically, rather than focussing on the requirements of the question.

(b) Responses to this question tended to be descriptive in nature and lacking in focus on why the Xian incident was important. Some candidates identified valid points such as the Xian incident being a propaganda victory for the CCP and that it resulted in the CCP being recognised as a legitimate party. Some responses were generalised statements only, stating that the Xian incident led to change.

© 2019

(c) Effective responses to this question explained agreement with the question hypothesis by focusing upon the strong leadership of Mao, the effective use of guerrilla warfare and the popularity of the Communists as they treated people well. On the other side of the argument, explanations were focused on Nationalist corruption and brutality, their lack of concern for ordinary people and the number of desertions from the Nationalist army. Some responses to this question were highly narrative in nature, and included lengthy descriptions of the Long March.

Questions 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Paper 13

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to help ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.
- Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

In **part (c)** questions the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond restating what has already been written in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important', 'how successful' or 'to what extent', depending on the question set.

General comments

Many answers reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and had acquired a great deal of information and they were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions which reward recall and description. The best answers to these questions were generally in the form of a short paragraph in which explanation.

The best answers to **part (b)** and **(c)** questions were those which were able to apply knowledge precisely to what the question is asked,, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information that was largely irrelevant. Candidates could gain some credit for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but better answers went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the exact demands of the question.

A significant number of responses to **part (c)** style questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation) but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Candidates should avoid repeating points already made in the essay but, instead, candidates should explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions confine themselves to merely asserting 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument is stronger than the other.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

Cambridge Assessment International Education

© 2019

Question 5

This was a popular question. Candidates performed well on **part (a)**, showing good knowledge of Germany's territorial losses at Versailles. Common misunderstandings included citing the Sudetenland and Anschluss as German losses. Better answers to **part (b)** explained the background to Mustapha Kemal's opposition to the Treaty of Sevres and why the terms caused a growth in Turkish nationalism. Candidates coped well with **part (c)**, offering reasons for and against the proposition that the Treaty of Versailles was unjust. Answers focused on diktat, war guilt and reparations on the one side, and on the treaty of Brest-Litovsk (as an example of double standards) on the other.

Question 6

Another popular question and candidates knew a great deal about **part (a)**, referencing Hitler's policy of Lebensraum, Munich and a desire to unite Sudeten Germans into the Reich. Some candidates confused the Munich Agreement with the final liquidation of Czechoslovakia in 1939. Two good explanations are needed in **part (b)** questions. The best answers explained Mussolini's aggressive foreign policy in the Mediterranean and Africa, as well as the ways in which militarisation was applied to combat the effects of the Depression. There was a tendency for other candidates to just describe the invasion of Abyssinia and/or Italy's intervention in the Spanish Civil War. Generally, however, candidates drew on a wide range of factors to explain the outbreak of war in 1939 in **part (c)**. Apart from the factor in the question, this usually included Appeasement, the Nazi-Soviet Pact and the policy of Lebensraum. Some responses were strong on narrative but higher marks were given when the narrative was linked directly to increasing tensions which created the climate for war.

Question 7

It was rare to see a poor answer to **part (a)**. The A bomb, as well as changes in personnel and policies were covered in detail. In **part (b)**, there a focus on the clash between Truman and Stalin about the treatment of Germany and the Berlin Blockade crisis. Some responses would have been improved by a greater focus on the dates in the question; a common misunderstanding is to confuse the Airlift with the building of the Berlin Wall. Candidates knew a great deal about the causes of the Cold War in **part (c)**. There were clear arguments balancing Stalin's need for a buffer zone and his mistrust of the West with the USA's stance reflected in the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan.. Some answers went beyond the scope of the question and included material from the 1960s. .

Question 8

Better responses to **part (a)** focused on the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis itself, rather than its causes and consequences. There were some good explanations in **part (b)** of the US desire to overthrow Castro, referencing the threat to American interests (economic and political) and the dangers which communism was thought to pose to Central and South America, given Cuba's proximity. **Part (c)** attracted some detailed arguments, although many tended to be unbalanced by concentrating on Khrushchev's failures. Better answers acknowledged the view that Khrushchev's acted as a responsible leader in the end, who also consolidated Cuba's role as a communist state close to the US, with the potential to expand communism still further.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

Parts (a) and **(b)** posed few problems. Candidates showed an understanding of artillery bombardments in **part (a)**, and the problems associated with frontal attacks on well defended trenches in **part (b)**. **Part (c)** attracted some generalised comments about the futility of trench warfare; the context of 1916 and the Battle of the Somme's impact on the outcome of the war were less well developed. Better answers balanced short term failure with a recognition that the Somme offered relief to the French, a chance to evolve tactics and weaponry while also weakening the German army in the longer term. Balanced, developed responses were seen, those with a relevant judgment being the strongest.

© 2019

Question 10

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 11

Candidates knew a great deal about Hitler's actions against the Communists in **part (a)**, and answers to **part (b)** contained detailed knowledge about the reasons why Hitler turned against the SA in 1934. Two developed causal factors were required, with the best answers referencing Rohm's challenge to Hitler, anxieties about the nature and violence of the SA and the role of the army. **Part (c)** enabled candidates to write at length about the impact of the Depression on the one hand, and a range of alternative factors on the other, to explain Hitler's rise to power in 1933. The best responses tended to the narrative to the demands of the question. In other responses, these links were not made sufficiently explicit. The best answers made a judgement about the relative importance of the relevant factors; the most successful attempts considering how the Depression created the pre-conditions for Hitler's assumption of power.

Question 12

Part (a) explored the changes for women brought about by the wartime labour shortage, as well as the demands of civil defence, Allied bombing and invasion. The radicalisation of Nazi policies towards the Jews during the war, particularly after the invasion of the USSR and the Wannsee Conference, formed the core of answers to **part (b)**. In **part (c)** candidates were asked to analyse the relative success of Germany's wartime economy. For example, some responses drew the contrast between unprecedented levels of munitions production and the failure to make best use of the labour supply.

Question 13

Part (a) was often answered well. Trotsky's role in the October Revolution was usually described in terms of his detailed military planning. Candidates were able to explain why War Communism caused opposition in **part (b)**, although many candidates provided only one causal factor in detail. **Part (c)** enabled candidates to use their detailed knowledge of the Civil War to explain the failure of the Whites. Many good answers were characterised by including a balance of factors which explored the problems faced by the Whites, compared with the strengths of the Reds. The best answers made a judgement about the relative importance of the relevant factors; the most successful attempts considered why the failure of the Whites owed more to the advantages held by the Bolsheviks, rather than their own shortcomings.

Question 14

This question explored Stalin's rule of the USSR. **Part (a)** examined what changed for ethnic groups, such as the impact of Russification, encompassing deportations, purges and campaigns against national identities. There were detailed descriptions of changes for women brought about by Stalin's policies in **part (b)**; In better answers, the narrative met the demands of the question, which in this case was a focus on explaining 'benefits'. The relative success of Stalin's economic policies was the focus of **part (c)**. The best answers were characterised by balancing the reasons why the USSR became the world's second largest industrial power with the damage caused by collectivisation.

Question 15

Candidates knew some of the methods used to encourage Americans to buy more in the 1920s (**part (a)**). Better answers focused on mass marketing, hire purchase and mail order schemes. **Part (b)** proved more challenging and attracted generalised definitions of tariffs. Some of these answers would have benefitted from being explained in the context of the boom of the 1920s. **Part (c)** responses tended to be balanced but descriptive. When narratives were linked to the demands of the question, i.e., in terms of the relative contribution of specific sectors of the economy to US prosperity, higher marks could be awarded. The best answers drew on knowledge of newer industries, such as car manufacturing with farming and older, traditional economic sectors.

Questions 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

Question 21

Answers showed some understanding in **part (a)** of Arab objections to the UNO Partition Plan, focussing on inequalities of land distribution and the view that Arab historic claims about self-determination had been overlooked. **Part (b)** responses tended to be descriptive but some were able to explain why Jewish nationalist violence was used in specific instances. For example, attacks on British military infrastructure would weaken control and drain resources. Answers to **part (c)** tended to be unbalanced. Candidates were stronger when explaining alternative factors such as Arab disorganisation and division; the extent and nature of international support for the Israelis in the 1948–9 war was less well known. A lack of balance in the answers hindered some candidates in their responses.

Question 22

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

Candidates should answer each question directly, ideally stating their conclusion in the opening sentence, for example, 'Bush made this speech in 1990 because…' or 'Source G does make Source F surprising because…'. In adopting this approach, candidates will already have planned their answers and thought carefully about the conclusion, only writing down the answer once they know what it is going to be.

The most important decisions to be made about many questions are **(i)** does the source need to be evaluated, and **(ii)** should contextual knowledge be used in the answer, and if it should, then how should it be used? When evaluating sources it is often useful to consider the purpose of the author or artist. Contextual knowledge should only be used if it helps to answer the question better. For example, contextual knowledge might help candidates work out the message of a source or its purpose or how reliable it is. Candidate should also remember that sources that are biased can still be very useful for historians. Candidates need to think about how they can be useful. .

When using sources - cartoons in particular, candidates need to try to work out what the big message is. In other words, what is the main point that the author or artist wants to make?

The whole paper leads up to **Question 6**, which asks for a consideration of all the sources in the option. Candidates must ensure that they leave enough time to answer it fully.

General comments

Although the overwhelming majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option, a good number of candidates answered on the nineteenth option. Some candidates did not answer **Question 6**, or answered it without using the sources. Comparison questions were answered well and the candidates' contextual knowledge was impressive. Some used this to carry out effective evaluation, while others were not sure about how to use it appropriately.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

This question was answered reasonably well. The two sources agree in many ways and candidates usually explained some of these agreements, for example Mazzini established Young Italy, he was born in Genoa and he wanted to end the power of the Pope. A small number of candidates were also able to explain disagreements. Disagreements included Mazzini's aims were clear in Source A but in B his thinking was vague. However, a good number of candidates were able to go further, by comparing the overall views of the sources about Mazzini. Source A claims he was significant to Italian unification, while Source B argues he was not significant or successful. It was good to see only a small number of candidates summarising each source and failing to compare them

Question 2

Most candidates used Source C to help them answer this question and some understood the relationship between the two sources. In Source D Mazzini is keen to declare his support for republican principles and to dismiss any claims that he had deserted these convictions. Source C begins to explain why he did this. He

© 2019

was worried that Source C could be seen as evidence of his support for the idea of Charles Albert becoming king of a united Italy. This is why in Source D he claims that he was actually pointing out why Charles Albert lacked the qualities to become such a king. Better responses understood the importance of the context. 1861 was the year the Kingdom of Italy was created. Mazzini (as the Background Information explains) opposed the new kingdom. This fits in with the sentiments he expresses in Source D which could have been published to underline his opposition to the new creation. Some candidates struggled to see the link between the two sources or the relevance of the context and tended to paraphrase Source D as an explanation for why it was published, while others only used the context of 1861 as the reason for publication and did not engage with the content of Source D.

Question 3

Weaker answers either identified parts of Source E which they asserted they did or did not trust, or simply stated that the source could not be trusted because it was written by Garibaldi and he would defend himself and criticise others. Better answers used contextual knowledge of either Garibaldi or Mazzini, or cross-reference to other sources, for example Mazzini's impracticable dreaming and Garibaldi's success as a military leader, to evaluate Garibaldi's account. There was a tendency in some answers to focus on the reasons why Garibaldi could, or could not be trusted, without actually stating what it was in Source E that was being checked.

Question 4

In a question such as this one the first important move is to compare what the two sources say. There is one clear disagreement – F contains much criticism of Mazzini, while Source G praises and defends him. This might suggest that G does make F surprising. However, there are also agreements, for example both sources show affection for Mazzini, which means that G does not make F surprising. A good number of candidates explained the disagreement and based their answer on it. A smaller number of candidates realised that it was also necessary to evaluate the sources, for example given Mazzini's record since 1852, Source F is not at all surprising. Less successful answers identified what they found surprising or not surprising in Source F but gave no valid reasons.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates just described the stamp, while others rejected it because of what it does not tell us about Mazzini (they had to identify what this was). Stronger responses realised that sources nearly always have some use and argued that the source shows us Mazzini was important by the very fact that he is on a stamp. However, the best answers focused on what we can learn from the fact that he is being honoured many years after his death on the Republic's twenty–fifth anniversary.

Question 6

A number of candidates did not attempt this question. Many of those that did answer this question did it very well, with explanations based on details in the sources, while others chose appropriate sources but struggled to explain how they supported or disagreed with the hypothesis Some analysed the sources but did not make clear which supported the hypothesis and which did not. Below are parts of two responses. The first is an example of an adequate explanation, while the second is not because it lacks reference to specific details in the sources:

'Source G supports the idea that Mazzini helped Italian unification. It says that he gave the Italians the idea and hope that Italy could become a "single, strong nation". He also helped Italians get rid of ''the seven or eight tyrants'' who were standing in the way of unification.'

'Sources E and F shows that Mazzini did not help Italian unification. They show that he was of little use and that unification did not happen because of him.'

There is for more guidance on **Question 6** in the section on the twentieth century option.

© 2019

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well by most candidates. They found both agreements and disagreements. Agreements included: Kuwait refused to help Iraq over the issue of oil, Iraq had a claim to Kuwait and Iraq wanted access to the sea. Disagreements included: in A Iraq was justified, in B it was not, A blames Kuwait, while B does not. Candidates need to explain agreements and disagreements clearly and precisely. For example, the following type of answer, provided by a number of candidates, does not achieve this: 'The sources agree over Iraq's problems.' However, other candidates made more adequate attempts, such as, 'Both sources say that Iraq had a claim over Kuwait.' A small number of candidates just summarised both sources and asserted that they agreed or disagreed, without carrying out any matching. Others compared the provenance of the sources but did not compare what they said, while others identified information that was in one source but not in the other. A small number of stronger responses managed to compare the overall big messages of the two sources – they both think that Iraq had a good case but Source B has less sympathy for Iraq's actions.

Question 2

In answering questions such as this it is important that candidates understand that there are two important steps. Firstly the sources need to be compared, and secondly one or both of the sources needs to be evaluated. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that in Source C Saddam is claiming that there was an American conspiracy, aided by some Arabs, against Iraq. They explained that Source D appears to support this claim because it mentions Kuwaiti officials secretly visiting the CIA and making plans against the USA. However, they also understood this this does not necessarily mean that Source D proves Saddam's claims to be true. They went on to evaluate either Source C or D. Some explained that Saddam's speech in Source C was made as the crisis was developing and he needed to whip up support for his policies, while others argued that Source D can be trusted because it was a private report that the Kuwaitis did not make public in which they admitted plotting against Iraq. Both approaches led the candidates to reaching a conclusion about how far Source D proves Saddam's claims in C to be true. Less successful answers were based on finding agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources without any evaluation. Some candidates explored whether the claims made in Source C could be trusted but they did not use Source C.

Question 3

Source E is open to many different reactions and interpretations and this question produced a wide range of answers. April Glaspie's statement was a surprising one at the time. In it she stated a desire for better relations with Iraq and good wishes for Iraq's attempts at rebuilding. Even more controversially, she stated that the USA had no interest in the border dispute between Iraq and Kuwait. She later added that the Iraqi version of her statement had left out her insistence that disputes between Iraq and Kuwait should be settled without the use of violence. The best answers argued that whatever the concerns about the reliability of Source E, it is clearly of immense value to the historian. This introduced an idea that candidates can struggle with – that an unreliable source can still be useful. Some of these candidates argued that the fact that the Iraqi transcripts may intentionally be less than an accurate account of what she actually said makes it useful because it raises questions about Iraqi motives and intentions. Other good answers suggested that Source E is useful because it shows that the USA was partly responsible for Iraq deciding to invade Kuwait or it helps us understand why Saddam may have understood American intentions. Less good answers argued that Source E is not useful. This was either because Source E is factually wrong about the USA not being interested in Kuwait or because it was an Iraqi transcript.

Question 4

This is a question about Bush's purpose – why did he make this speech at that particular time? The best answers, and there were many of them, were produced by candidates who realised this. They set the speech into its context and suggested a valid purpose for Bush, such as persuading countries to join the multi-national force or Americans to support his policy in the Gulf. It is important to note that purpose must involve changing the behaviour of the intended audience.

Weaker, but reasonable, answers either suggested that the context was the reason for Bush's speech – that he made the speech because of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, or that he made the speech to justify his sending of troops.

© 2019

There were a number of candidates who struggled with the question and got no further than paraphrasing the sources. Some struggled because, although they explained the context or the message of the speech, these were not given as the reason for making the speech. It is important that somewhere in their answer candidates make a clear and explicit statement about why Bush made the speech.

Question 5

A number of candidates struggled with these cartoons and gave simple surface readings of them. Some took them literally and thought that Saddam was running away with barrels of oil or that the USA was not in the Gulf for oil. A number did produce valid interpretations of one or both of the cartoons based on sub-messages, for example Source H is saying that American soldiers were dying for the sake of oil. Fewer compared the sub-messages. The most common valid comparison was that they agree that the crisis was over oil. The best answers compared the big messages of the cartoons. Source G blames Saddam for wanting oil, while Source H blames Bush for wanting oil.

Question 6

This question should be answered last because the understanding of the sources developed by candidates while answering the earlier questions can be relevant to **Question 6**. Candidates need to leave enough time to allow themselves to produce a developed answer containing careful explanations. The best answers demonstrate the following characteristics: **(i)** all, or nearly all, of the sources are used; **(ii)** sources both supporting the hypothesis and disagreeing with the hypothesis are used; **(iii)** care is taken in making clear which sources are being used to support the hypothesis and which are being used to disagree with it; **(iv)** the content of the sources is used as the basis for careful explanations of whether sources support or disagree with the hypothesis; **(v)** sources are explained individually. Although it can be helpful to group the sources into those supporting the hypothesis and those disagreeing with it, this should not replace each source being individually explained. Some candidates struggled because they grouped the sources and then made general comments about all the sources in that group. The best responses grouped the sources but then wrote about each one in turn. This involved using the evidence in the sources. Below are parts of two responses, the first of which demonstrates a satisfactory use of the sources, while the second does not. The first response refers to, and uses, specific details in the source. The second response only makes a general assertion

‘Source F does show that Iraq was to blame for the crisis. This is because it tells us that Iraq used unjustified and brutal aggression against Kuwait. It says that Iraq invaded a peaceful country without ‘’provocation or warning’’.’

‘Sources C and D do not prove that Iraq was responsible for the crisis over Kuwait. Instead, they show that the USA was the country causing trouble and was to blame for the crisis.’

Some candidates, although demonstrating an understanding of the sources, did not make clear which sources supported the hypothesis and which disagreed with the hypothesis. Finally, there were some candidates who neglected to make any use of the sources. These candidates would have benefited from an understanding that **Question 6** is asking them whether *the sources* provide convincing evidence in support of the hypothesis, not whether they themselves agree with the hypothesis.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

- Candidates should take time at the start of the examination to read through the whole paper and familiarise themselves with the sources. There will often be opportunities to refer to sources other than those specifically mentioned in any given question, so it is important to know what all the sources say before an answer to any of the questions is started.
- Candidates should give direct answers to the questions. If asked why a source was produced, then reasons should be given. If asked how useful a source is, the focus should be on its utility as evidence. Rather than repeating what the sources say; candidates should be using the content of the sources to explain their answers.
- Candidates should answer all the questions. They should plan their time properly, making sure to leave sufficient time for **Question 6**, which asks for a consideration of all the sources.

General comments

There were too few scripts completed on the nineteenth-century option for any meaningful comments to be made on them. This report is, therefore, based on the scripts completed on the twentieth-century option. Scripts were usually complete, and there was little evidence of any misunderstanding of the sources. Two features stood out. First, the depth of contextual knowledge demonstrated in the answers was impressive, which had a beneficial effect on the level of comprehension of the sources in context that candidates were able to display, and thereby use, in their answers. Second, the ability of candidates to evaluate sources, particularly in relation to the purpose of the author, was very much in evidence. These two aspects of candidates' answers, especially when brought together, meant that the overall quality of candidates' responses was very good.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

There were too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

The question asked candidates to compare two sources. These contained numerous similarities and differences, and nearly all candidates were able to make at least one valid comparison. Better answers included examples both of similarities and differences. The issue was whether candidates were able to perceive what counted as valid comparison. True comparisons can only be made on the basis of common criteria; in effect, that 'like with like' must be compared. In these two sources some clear similarities existed, such as the agreement that Iran under the Shah faced economic difficulties. Problems arose, however, when candidates attempted to compare more complex issues, such as the aims of the revolutionaries, where the sources suggested multiple factors were in play. Answers sometimes then struggled to include all the necessary points to complete a true comparison.

© 2019

Question 2

Candidates were asked to compare the messages of two cartoons depicting the Shah. Whilst most were able to detect that the cartoons were critical of the Shah, there was some misinterpretation, seeing Source C as portraying the Shah as upset by the plight of the poor, and Source D as the Shah putting money into the pockets of the Iranian people. There was a lot of description of what the cartoons showed, often an indication of candidates being unsure about the cartoons' messages. Many answers started by assuming that a source showed something, for example the Shah's sympathy in Source C, but then changed tack as they noticed more details, such as the money spilling out of his pocket. However, the majority of candidates eventually found their way to making a genuine comparison of the critical messages, such as perceiving the Shah as corrupt or uncaring in both cartoons.

Question 3

This was one of the questions where contextual knowledge of the events of the revolution was very helpful for candidates in evaluating the purposes of the Shah in representing events as he did in Sources E and F. However, an essential first step to answering the question was to compare the content of the sources for similarities and differences in the claims they made. Some candidates were, in fact, prepared to reach a judgement on the issue of whether or not Source F was surprising simply on the basis of whether or not it agreed with what Source E said. Better answers moved on to explaining whether agreements/disagreements were surprising by evaluating the sources. This could be done on the basis of cross-reference to what other sources claimed, but was much more plausible when done through analysis of the Shah's purpose.

Question 4

Some candidates, when asked why something happened, did not provide any reason, and simply wrote about the source, perhaps also interpreting it. This question asked why Khomeini made a speech in late 1979. On such questions, reasons could relate to context – he made it because of what was going on at that time; to message – he made it because of what he wanted to say to the audience; and to purpose – the impact that he intended to make on the audience. In practice, answers tended to include elements of more than one of these, but if properly explained, as in the best responses, purpose is always the strongest route through an explanation since it rests on the other aspects; that is, it includes an awareness of what he wanted to say at that particular time, whereas context and message on their own fall short of an awareness of purpose.

Question 5

In asking whether or not Source H could be believed, the question invited an evaluation which, again, many candidates were well prepared to provide on the basis of the source's purpose. The extract was taken from an article in an Iranian newspaper, published just before the Shah fled Iran. It appeared to give information about Khomeini, some of which seemed factual, and some not. Some candidates based their answers on whether or not these statements in the source were true, and used material from other sources or from their background knowledge to check. Given the provenance, it was reasonable enough to give greater weight to what was demonstrably untrue, as reaching an overall conclusion that the source could be believed was not very credible. The best answers, though, were more concerned with why the Iranian government would want Khomeini represented in this way, rather than with issues of factual in/accuracy, explaining its purpose in trying to undermine Khomeini's reputation as a means of shoring up the Shah's crumbling regime.

Question 6

Candidates should know that **Question 6** will ask them to test the sources against a given hypothesis, and that there will always be evidence in the sources which can be used both to support and challenge it. Some answers were based simply on support. There were several sources which indicated that Khomeini was important to the revolution, and generally candidates were able to find some evidence from them to illustrate how. In challenging the hypothesis, many of the sources showed that factors other than Khomeini were important. For the majority of candidates this was the sensible way of challenging the hypothesis, and they could, for example, use Sources C and D (the anti-Shah cartoons) to argue that it was not Khomeini who caused the revolution, but instead it was the cruel and corrupt regime of the Shah. There were still some candidates who answered **Question 6** without making any reference to the sources, and whose answers were simply essays on the topic.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

This paper requires candidates to address in a valid way the particular skill or concept demanded by each question. It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. Of equal importance is understanding exactly what a source says or shows. Time spent carefully studying the sources before answering is essential; this will help candidates assess the claims being made by the authors, and to appreciate potential links between different sources.

The most successful answers are planned before the candidate begins to write their response. Candidates should always work out what their answer is to be and then commence writing by answering the question in their opening sentence. A helpful strategy here is to use the words from the question. For example, on **Question 5**, 'I am surprised/not surprised by source G because…' The rest of the answer should then use both the source/s and relevant knowledge to explain the opening statement.

If quotations from the sources are used, and this can be particularly useful when answering **Question 6**, candidates should not use an abbreviated form of a quotation that misses out some of the words. The words that are used must support the point the candidates wants to make, hence the importance of providing the quotation in full.

While many candidates did well in response to **Question 6**, there were a significant number of scripts where the sources were not used as the basis of the answer. Candidates that grouped the sources together and made general comments about the statement also did not always perform as strongly as they could have. Candidates must engage with the content of each source and make it clear whether they are using it to agree or disagree with the given statement. It is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support and challenge the given statement.

Finally, candidates should be advised to read both the background information and all the sources before beginning to respond to any of the questions on the paper. This will give them an understanding of the main issue of the exam paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding will feed into all of their answers, as well as helping to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.

General comments

Most candidates responded reasonably well to the demands of the paper. The great majority of candidates opted for the twentieth-century topic; consequently, there were too few responses on the nineteenth-century option for meaningful comments to be made. There were very few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both the options.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

There were too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify agreements between the two sources. For instance, the sources both agree that the Shah was unpopular with the people, the Shah was an unpleasant or brutal leader and that Khomeini wanted an Islamic revolution or had Islamic ideals. The differences proved more challenging for candidates to pick out. However, a good number were able to do this successfully, explaining, for example, that in Source A, the people support Khomeini and his call for an Islamic state, while in Source B, the people want a constitutional democracy. The best candidates were able to explain the overarching 'big message', being that the author of Source A is positive about Khomeini, whereas the author of Source B is more negative or critical of him. A small number of candidates were unable to identify valid points of comparison between the sources. The best way to carry out comparisons is to use a common criterion – first, focus on a point about a particular subject that is made in one source, and then, to see if the other source says the same thing about that subject, for example, Source A says Khomeini preached about the ills of the Shah's regime – does Source B say anything about this, and if so, does it agree or disagree?

Question 2

In **Question 2**, candidates were asked to consider two written sources and conclude whether the author of one would have agreed with the other. Specifically, they were asked whether Bakhtiar, whose speech forms Source D, would have agreed with the speech given by Khomeini in Source C. A good number of candidates understood that Bakhtiar would have agreed and/or disagreed with Source C. For example, Source D could be used to explain that Bakhtiar would have agreed with the criticisms made of the Shah in Source C; he also would have agreed that Khomeini had the support of the people and that they supported dictatorship. Many candidates found it easier to explain why Bakhtiar would have disagreed with Source C, for instance, he would not agree that Khomeini should set up his own government as he wanted to give the people freedom and democracy. What was crucial in this question, and indeed all questions on this paper, was to engage directly with what the sources say. Some candidates attempted to construct an answer to the question using only their contextual knowledge about Bakhtiar and Khomeini. While contextual knowledge was very important in a top level explanation of *why* Bakhtiar would have disagreed with Source C, answers needed to base their explanations on clear reference to the content of the sources.

Question 3

There were many reasonable answers to this question. A small number of candidates based their answers on a simple repeating or paraphrasing of the source, or they did not address the crucial issue of usefulness at any point in the response. There were also a number of candidates whose assessment of usefulness was based on an undeveloped use of the source's provenance; such responses tended to dismiss the source as not useful due to bias, as it was written by a leading Iranian cleric, or because it was produced many years after Khomeini's death. Better responses were able to explain that the source is useful because of what can be learnt from it, they could then use their contextual knowledge or cross reference to other sources on the paper, in order to arrive at a judgement about usefulness. The best responses were from candidates who could explain how the content and the provenance of the source make it useful. They inevitably made reference to how the fact that the source was produced nineteen years after Khomeini's death, or on the anniversary of his death, made it useful. It is worth pointing out that the focus of question was on the Iranian Revolution; some candidates based their responses wholly on Khomeini, rather than the Revolution.

Question 4

This question, which focused on the message of Source F, proved problematic for some candidates. While many could explain sub-messages such as the Shah is violent or Khomeini is brutal or indeed that both men are both of these things, ewer were able to explain sub-messages that involved a comparison of both men with a sense of their being equal. A large part of the cartoonist's message is that the Shah and Khomeini are as bad as each other, as oppressive as each other or as brutal as each other. When candidates are asked about the message of a source, they should always try and consider the author's voice or opinion. In this instance the best responses were from candidates that could appreciate that the cartoonist has a negative attitude towards both leaders, with his overall message being that the change of regime or leadership will not help Iran or its people.

© 2019

Question 5

This question asked whether or not Source G is surprising. The crucial thing in a question of this nature is for candidates to make it clear whether or not they are surprised, and by what – only then can their explanations have a proper focus. Another thing for candidates to remember is that explanations should be consistent with the stance taken on surprise. Some candidates lost sight of this as their answers developed. Only a few candidates neglected to address the issue of surprise in their answers and a large majority could identify something within the source that surprised or did not surprise them; an explanation of their reasons for this would have further improved some of these responses. Many candidates based their explanations solely on Source G and used every day empathy or undeveloped provenance to explain their surprise or lack of surprise. For example, candidates were not surprised that the government did not appreciate the workers as they were bound to side with the rich, or not surprised that Dehghani would oppose the new government as she was a communist. To achieve a stronger response on a question of this type, candidates need to do two things. Firstly, they must consider the source as a whole, rather than focus an answer on details within it. Secondly, to explain surprise or a lack of surprise, candidates need to look to the other sources on the paper, or use relevant contextual knowledge, to support their arguments.

Question 6

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved high marks by carefully explaining how some of the sources (A, B, C, D and E) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that Khomeini had the same aims as the Iranian people, while others (B, D, F and G) argue that Khomeini's aims were different or opposed to those of the Iranians. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Some candidates did not make it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. Another aspect was the grouping of the sources. It is advisable to always examine the sources one by one, as any comment about a group must be valid for every source in the group. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **Question 6** by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement. Candidates can then continue by writing about the sources in order, or by addressing those that support the statement before moving on to deal with those that reject it. What is crucial is that clear explanations about how the content of a source provides evidence to either support or dispute the hypothesis are given. A clear example of this could be; 'Source B shows that Khomeini did not have the same aims as the Iranian people. It tells us that his 'ambition was to establish an Islamic state' in which all power would be given to religious leaders who would govern according to Islamic law. The people did not want this, they wanted a constitutional democracy, but it was of no concern to Khomeini that his 'programme bore little relation to the wishes of the majority of the people'. '

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

Coursework assignment titles must assess significance.

In their answers, candidates should directly address the title. They should focus on assessment of significance, rather than on description or narrative. To do this, they should use a range of criteria.

The mark scheme should be used holistically by teachers. Candidates are not expected to cover every aspect of a level descriptor. Teachers should use a 'best fit' approach to the levels when marking.

General comments

A wide-range of work was seen. Some of the assignments were of a very high standard, and some were less strong.

Most centres despatched their candidates' work in good time and with the necessary documentation, which was usually completed carefully and accurately. Most of the candidates completed work on the Germany or USA Depth Studies, although there were some interesting titles based on local history.

Comments specific questions

The vast majority of centres set appropriate titles which allowed their candidates to focus on assessing significance. It is important that the title of the coursework assignment does not encourage candidates to focus on causation, rather than on significance. For example, a title such as 'Assess the importance of the Depression as a reason for Hitler's rise to power' restricts answers to Hitler's rise to power and may lead candidates to compare the relative importance of a number of reasons. It puts the focus on explaining an outcome, rather than on the broad significance of a factor. On the other hand, a title such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany' places the focus clearly on the Depression and is much more open. It allows candidates to use a range of criteria such as political, social and economic to carry out a broad assessment of the different ways in which the Depression was significant. When constructing a title, it is important to consider whether the subject to be assessed for significance has the potential to be assessed in different ways. For example, if it can only be assessed for its political short term significance, then it would be better to devise another question. Making sure that titles do not name an outcome helps to ensure that they are suitable. It is also important that titles are not set on content from the core content studied by the centre. They should be set on one of the Depth Studies or on a Depth Study devised by a centre.

It is strongly recommended that centres use the following wording in their titles: 'Assess the significance of….' An exception to this is when the focus is on the idea of 'turning point' when a title such as, ''How far was the Munich Putsch a turning point in Germany?' would be acceptable.

The titles used in this examination session varied a great deal but examples of the types of title which worked well are:

'How far was the New Deal a turning point for the USA?'

'Assess the significance of the Reichstag Fire for Germany.'

'Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch for Germany.'

'Assess the significance of the Cold War for apartheid in South Africa.'

© 2019

There were some excellent and interesting answers. One characteristic of the best answers was that they focused on assessment of significance. They did not spend time on description, narrative or on explaining the background. They used a range of criteria to assess significance. These varied according to the subject being assessed. For some subjects, criteria such as political, economic, social and religious worked well. For others, depth and breadth of impact and long and short term were effective. The concept of turning point is a useful one to introduce to candidates and can work well with certain subjects. Using a range of criteria helped candidates to attempt broad assessments of significance. They did not focus on just one way in which their subject may have been significant.

Another characteristic was that they focused on assessment. They did not just explain ways in which their subject was significant, they assessed how far it was significant. This was often achieved through the use of argument and counter-argument.

Finally, the best answers reached and supported an overall conclusion about significance. Sometimes they concluded that in some ways their subject was significant, but in other ways it was not, while other answers reached conclusions about the most important way in which their subject was significant.

Some less successful answers identified some criteria at the beginning but then drifted into description and narrative. These answers tended to, for example, describe what somebody did and then assert that this made them significant. Others confused failure with lack of significance. It is important to realise that failures can be very significant.

It was clear that much of the marking had been carried out with care. There were many helpful annotations identifying strengths and weaknesses of answers. Summative comments were very useful for the Moderators, especially when they summed up the key characteristics of an answer and matched these with statements in the mark scheme.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates need to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

A wide range of Depth Studies was undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945 was the most popular choice this session, followed by Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941. A number of candidates attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918 but there were too few attempts at Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) and G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were a few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918

Question 1 was much more widely-answered, with only a very small number of candidates attempting **Question 2** this session.

Question 1 proved challenging for a good number of candidates, with some struggling with the term ‘nature of war on the Western Front’. Stronger answers focused on the trench system and the conditions in the trenches for soldiers on the Western Front and explained how this led to a static, defensive war. This was balanced by examining other factors such as the use of new weapons like the machine gun, the impact of artillery and gas weapons, and the tactics used by the military leaders of both sides. Less successful responses tended to be descriptive, rather than analytical, and often struggled to focus on the question, instead giving a narrative of the war on the Western Front from 1914.

Question 2 produced too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Question 3 and **Question 4** were answered by high numbers of candidates. .

Question 3 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to have a solid knowledge and understanding of the territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles and the responses were often given balance by examining the importance of other terms of the Treaty. This sometimes limited the scope and range of the answers, as there were other factors beyond the Treaty that led to problems in early Weimar Germany. The strongest responses examined a range of the territorial terms, such as the loss of Germany's overseas colonies, Alsace-Lorraine and the Polish Corridor and explained how this had a negative impact on Germany's pride, economy and population. This was often balanced by examining the importance of the military restrictions, the reparations and the War Guilt Clause. The best answers also considered the importance of political extremism from the left and right, the nature of the Weimar Constitution and its inherent weaknesses, as well as the immediate impact of the First World War. Weaker responses tended to focus in on the Treaty alone, without examining other aspects that caused problems in early Weimar Germany. There were also factual errors made about the Treaty in some circumstances. A few candidates also went beyond the chronological parameters of the question and began examining Hitler's rise to power in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Question 4 was, in general, answered less competently than **Question 3**, although there were some strong responses. The best answers were able to examine in some detail how the SA and SS were used by the Nazis to secure power by 1934 and focused on the use of the SA after the Reichstag Fire and during the March 1933 elections and the successive passing of the Enabling Act. Candidates then examined the role played by the SS in running the concentration camps, though some confused these with the later extermination camps during the Second World War. Some also analysed the significance of the SS in the Night of the Long Knives in removing Rohm and the power of the SA, thus securing the loyalty of the German Army and the support of the President. This was then balanced by looking at the powers given to Hitler by the Reichstag Fire Decree and the Enabling Act, the banning of trade unions and other political parties, the role of the Gestapo and propaganda. Weaker responses tended to be vague on the significance played by the SA and SS, with some candidates confusing the two organisations. Many candidates also focused on the role of the Hitler Youth and the control of the school curriculum which mainly comes after 1934. One or two responses also saw this question as focusing on Hitler's rise to power and how the Nazis increased their electoral success in 1930–32. While there is some relevance in this material, the question is focused on the period after Hitler became Chancellor.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-1941

A number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. Responses were very evenly split between **Question 5** and **Question 6**.

Question 5 was the better answered of the two questions. The strongest responses examined the economic problems before 1917 in Russia and explained how this led to disturbances such as the 1905 Bloody Sunday incident, the riots in the countryside and strikes in the urban areas during the 1905 Revolution, as well as the impact of fuel and food shortages during the First World War which helped cause the March 1917 Revolution. This was then balanced by examining other factors such as the role played by wars (Russo-Japanese War and the First World War), the actions of the Tsar and the maintenance of the autocracy and opposition political groups. The best answers addressed importance well and explained their arguments with good factual support. Weaker responses tended to be vague and descriptive. Some candidates neglected to cover the whole period set in the question and did not examine the years 1914–17.

Question 6 was answered less well than **Question 5**, though there were some good responses. The strongest answers examined the significance defence had on Stalin's economic policies, namely the fear of a future invasion from the West and the threat of Nazi Germany after 1933. Answers focused on the Five-Year Plans and how they increased industrial production in heavy industry and later armaments. Some answers also examined collectivisation and correctly explained how this policy was crucial to feed the workforce and soldiers, as well as provide capital for technology needed for a future invasion. This was then balanced by examining other causes for Stalin's economic policies. Most cited were Stalinist ideology (Socialism in One Country), competition from the capitalist West, the need to make the USSR a global superpower and Stalin's own prestige. Many of the less successful responses would have been improved by more precise detail and a greater factual knowledge of the era. Many also focused their response on the impact of Stalin's economic policies, as opposed to the causes.

© 2019

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was the second most popular topic among candidates, with **Question 7** generating many more responses than **Question 8**.

Question 7 was generally well answered. The strongest responses had a sound knowledge of the importance of the motor industry in causing the economic boom in the 1920s. Many candidates were able to provide excellent factual details on the Ford motor company and the role played by Henry Ford and his assembly line form of production. This was then developed by explaining the knock-on effect the motor industry had on other sectors of the economy such as glass, rubber, road building and urban development. This was then balanced with a wide variety of alternative factors. Commonly cited were the importance of Republican policies, the nature of the consumer society and confidence, advertising, the First World War and the USA's natural resources. The best answers gave focused explanations that addressed importance and used in-depth examples to support their arguments, and often reached valid conclusions. A small number of weaker responses tended to be descriptive, as some candidates lost focus in providing mainly detail at the expense of explaining how these factors actually helped cause the economic boom.

Question 8 was less well answered in general, although there were some candidates that fully understood the question and its demands. The strongest answers examined the loss of overseas markets due to high tariffs and foreign competition and explained how this led to a declining export market, as well as falling prices domestically. They also explained how this caused overproduction and the subsequent fall in profit, leading to wage cuts and unemployment. This was then balanced by examining the significance of over speculation and overconfidence that helped lead to the Wall Street Crash and the blame that could be apportioned to the Republican governments during the 1920s. Many of the weaker responses tended to be light on detail or only gave one-sided answers. A few candidates confused the Wall Street Crash and the Depression- while there is a clear link between the two events, they are not the same, thing though they share many of the same causes.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

There were too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study F: South Africa, c. 1940–c. 1994

There were too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A small number of candidates opted for this Depth Study, but only examples of **Question 13** were seen in any significant number. .

Question 13 was well answered by some candidates, who focused clearly on the chronology set out in the question. Candidates examined the role played by Israeli aggression in the 1956 war, the Six-Day War and the Yom Kippur War, and explained how Israel, sometimes with the help of other global powers, was a major cause of conflict. This was then balanced by examining the importance of the Arab states, such as Egypt and Syria, Arab nationalism, the role of the USA and USSR, and the long-term impact caused by the refugee crisis after 1948 and the forming of extremist groups such as al-Fatah and later the PLO. The best responses were focused and explained the relative importance of the different factors using good supporting evidence. Other responses were often descriptive would have benefited from more contextual knowledge. A few candidates focused too much on the causes of 1948–49 war, which was outside of the chronology of this question.

Question 14 produced too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Paper 4: Alternative to coursework is a one-hour paper that requires candidates to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. Paper 4 questions are based on the centre's choice of Depth Study and so an in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

A wide range of Depth Studies were undertaken for IGCSE History 0470.42: Alternative to Coursework in this year's October session. Depth Study B: Germany 1918–1945 was the most popular choice this session, followed by Depth Study D: USA, 1919–1941 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941. Several centres also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War but there were too few attempts at Depth Studies E, F and G to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but very few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were a few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or failed to properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote all they knew about the topic or Depth Study in general instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918

Both questions were attempted by candidates this session, although **Question 2** tended to be the more popular choice.

Question 1 was generally poorly answered by candidates this session. The best answers were balanced in structure and examined not only the importance of the First Battle of Ypres as a cause of trench warfare but also other factors such as the Battle of the Marne after the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, new technology such as the machine gun and improved artillery and the impact of Russian mobilisation. These responses gave a good level of factual detail and began to explain the relative importance of each of the factors. Many weaker responses tended to be descriptive or only focused on the trenches and the conditions in them instead of focusing on the causes of trench warfare. Candidates need to ensure they read the question carefully and provide balanced responses.

Question 2 was generally better answered than **Question 1**. A few strong answers were able to cite some of the events that demonstrated falling support for the war in Germany by 1918 and gave examples such as the Kiel Mutiny and the German Revolution in their arguments. They also explained how war weariness caused by food and fuel shortages which was partially due to the British blockade of the German ports fed into the declining support. This was then balanced by examining the significance of war time leaders such as Hindenburg and Ludendorff, the failure of Operation Michael to provide a German breakthrough, the superior resources of the Allies and US entry into the war by the end of 1917. Some focused explanations were given

© 2019

supported by relevant and precise factual evidence. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive and many candidates gave a narrative of the entire war going back to 1914 which was not relevant.

Depth Study B: Germany 1918–1945

Both **Questions 3** and **4** were attempted in good number by candidates this session, although **Question 4** proved to be slightly more popular.

Question 3 was generally less well answered than **Question 4**. Candidates had a poor grasp of the terms laid out in the 25 Point Programme with some candidates believing that it was introduced after the Munich Putsch in 1923, confusing it with Mein Kampf. A few stronger answers were able to cite the Nazi's aims of abolishing the Treaty of Versailles, reclaiming lost German territory, improving pensions and creating Lebensraum and then explain how this helped develop the broadly nationalist and anti-Semitic focus for the Nazi Party as well as give it some socialist credentials. This was then balanced by examining the importance of the Munich Putsch and Hitler's imprisonment where he decided to change tactics and make the Nazi Party an electable party. A few references were also made to the importance of the SA and SS and even the Hitler Youth. Many candidates also examined the importance of electoral success during the Depression, Hitler's appointment as Chancellor, the consolidation of Nazi rule 1933–34 and the death of Hindenburg. The strongest responses were clearly focused on how these factors developed the Nazi Party and explained their arguments clearly. Weaker responses tended to be thin in terms of contextual knowledge or focused more on how Hitler got into power, which while relevant, is not the precise focus of the question. Candidates clearly had issue with the term 'development of the Nazi Party' in this question and the term was not fully understood by some candidates.

Question 4 was, in general, answered more competently than **Question 3**, although there were some weaker responses. The best answers were able to identify Himmler's significant role in establishing the Nazi dictatorship through his command of the SS and with this the concentration camps and the Gestapo by 1934. This was then balanced by examining other factors such as the role of the SA, particularly during 1933 and the Reichstag Fire and the passing of the Enabling Act, the Concordat with the Catholic church, the banning of trade unions and opposition parties and the Night of the Long Knives. Good responses were high in detail and gave valid explanations on the significance of each of the factors with the very best answers reaching substantiated conclusions. Weaker responses tended to misunderstand the term 'establishing the Nazi dictatorship'. While it was valid to argue that electoral success and Hitler's appointment as Chancellor were significant in establishing the dictatorship, the focus of the question is clearly 1933–34 rather than pre-1933. A few candidates were not able to correctly or accurately describe Himmler's role and confused him with other Nazi officials or personalities from the era thereby giving inaccurate responses.

Depth Study C: Russia 1905–1941

Several centres attempted this Depth Study. **Question 5** proved to be slightly more popular among candidates than **Question 6** this session.

Question 5 was well answered in most circumstances, though a lack of knowledge or a more narrative approach to this question prevented many potentially good answers from reaching higher levels. The best responses had a clear focus on the importance of the Kornilov Affair and its impact on the Provisional Government under Kerensky and the help it gave to the Bolsheviks. Many explanations were provided by the best answers of how the coup helped bolster the support given to the Bolsheviks who were viewed at the time as saviours of the Soviets and how it armed them for the November seizure of power. Good levels of detail were often provided to support these arguments. This was then balanced against other important factors for Bolshevik success such as the failures of the Provisional Government to deal with Russia's issues in 1917 such as the socio-economic impact of the war, the land issue and the failure to hold elections for a Constituent Assembly. A few candidates also examined the role of Lenin and Trotsky and general Bolshevik agitation in this period which was also valid. Weaker responses tended to lack contextual knowledge of the Kornilov Affair, with a few confusing the event with the July Days. One or two candidates also confused Kornilov with Kerensky.

Question 6 was answered well in some circumstances, especially when candidates got to grip with the focus of the question which was how Stalin maintained his dictatorship. The strongest responses gave a range of examples of how Stalin controlled aspects of the media and strictly censored information. Many also cited how the media was used to create a cult of personality around Stalin as well as disgrace old Bolshevik leaders such as Trotsky. This was then balanced by examining other significant factors such as the use of the NKVD, the purges and show trials, the fear of the gulags as well as Stalin's economic policies, particularly the significance of collectivisation which helped Stalin eliminate opposition in the countryside.

© 2019

The best answers contained well-supported explanations and strong factual knowledge with some candidates able to reach substantiated conclusions about the most significant factor. Weaker responses tended to lack range or depth, and a few mistook this question as a question asking candidates to examine how Stalin became leader by 1928.

Depth Study D: USA 1919–1941

This was the second most popular topic, with both **Questions 7** and **8** proving popular with candidates.

Question 7 proved more problematic for many candidates who were not clear on what 'older industries' were by the 1920s such as coal, textiles and leather. Many candidates focused on farming, which while acceptable, was not the only industry facing economic problems in the 1920s. Stronger responses got to grips with the term and explained how older industries were facing falling prices and with it lower wages and unemployment due to electrification or new synthetic textiles. Some candidates then balanced their responses by examining how newer industries were more important to the economy in this period and examined the motor industry, construction and new consumer electrical appliances such as radios and refrigerators. A few candidates took a wider scope with this question and explained the importance of Republican policies and consumer confidence to the US economy of the 1920s which was equally valid. Weaker responses tended to lack knowledge of the older industries and only provided quality material when examining alternative factors, though candidates' knowledge of the problems facing the farming industry was generally solid.

Question 8 was generally well answered this session. Candidates had a good knowledge and understanding of the role played by the fear of communism and the subsequent 'Red Scare' in the USA in the 1920s and often provided an abundance of precise examples to support their arguments. Most cited were the bomb attack on Mitchell Palmer's home and his subsequent Palmer Raids and the case of Sacco and Vanzetti. This was then balanced by examining alternative factors that shaped US society in the 1920s such as the role played by the Ku Klux Klan, racism and segregation in the South, religious fundamentalism and Prohibition. A few candidates looked wider than intolerance and examined the significance played by new forms of entertainment such as movies, radio, jazz music and sports and also the impact of the car on US society, which were all equally valid factors to analyse. The strongest answers demonstrated range and depth in terms of evidence and provided focused explanations of the relative significance of each factor. The best answers also provided substantiated conclusions about which factor/s were the most significant. Weaker responses tended to be either one-sided answers that only examined the fear of communism or descriptive in style. A few candidates focused only on intolerance rather than the factors that shaped US society as a whole, though this did not necessarily impede them from providing good responses.

Depth Study E: China 1930–1990

Too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Depth Study F: South Africa: 1940–1997

Too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

Too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates need to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies was undertaken, with Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-1941 being the most popular. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-1945 was also answered by many candidates, as was Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-1941. There was a small number of responses to Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918 but very low numbers on the other Depth Studies.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were a few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918

There were a limited number of responses to this Depth Study, with too few responses to **Question 1** for meaningful comments to be made.

Most candidates attempted **Question 2**, which focused on the reasons for Germany's defeat in 1918. There was a lack of knowledge of Allied tactics, although there was a better understanding of events in Germany as a reason for defeat. Some responses showed a good knowledge of the British Blockade and its impact on Germany.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This was a popular Depth Study, with many responses to both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Question 3 was the most answered question in this option. The focus of the question was on opposition to the Nazis from 1933 to the fall of the regime in 1945. As such it was focused on the Nazis in power, rather than their rise to power. Many candidates had a good detailed knowledge of youth opposition groups, for example the Swing Movement, the Edelweiss Pirates and White Rose. Some used the Hitler Youth and German Maidens as a counter argument. Most were aware of Church opposition, although many confused Roman Catholic and Protestant attempts. Very few included opposition from the army but there was some mention of underground socialist and communist groups.

© 2019

Question 4 was also answered by many candidates. The focus of this question was on how the Nazi regime won support. This indicated a focus on support for Hitler once he was in power. However, many candidates only described how Hitler gained support before 1933. Successful responses showed an understanding of Nazi government policies towards farmers and balanced this with a focus on workers and industrialists. In these responses a good knowledge of measures such as Strength Through Joy and Public Works was demonstrated.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Question 5 was answered by a number of candidates. The focus of this question was on how the Tsar was able to remain in government until March 1917. Successful responses were able to show reasons for his survival, rather than reasons for the downfall of the regime. Many, however, described why the Tsar fell from power. These responses lacked specific detail or relevance to the question. There were some general misunderstandings of the respective roles of peasants and workers and of the position of the middle class.

Question 6 was more popular and was focused on how Stalin was able to take control in the USSR following the death of Lenin. Incorporating the NEP into this proved a problem with some candidates who mistakenly thought that it was Stalin's policy. Some confused it with the Five-Year Plans. Stronger responses were able to show how Stalin was able to play his political rivals off against each other and demonstrated a good knowledge of Trotsky's failings and the impact of Stalin's position as General Secretary. There was a tendency to drift beyond the scope of the question and describe the creation of the totalitarian state after 1928.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

The USA was the most popular option with **Question 7** being chosen most often.

The focus of **Question 7** was on the causes of intolerance in the USA during the 1920s. This question was answered well in general. A good knowledge of the KKK was demonstrated, with many detailed descriptions of their activities. Other causes of intolerance were also well known but some responses mainly consisted of detailed descriptions, rather than attempted explanation. More successful candidates provided balance with descriptions of the Red Scare, the impact of Religious Fundamentalism and Prohibition. Less successful responses mixed up knowledge and showed limited understanding of the concept of intolerance.

Question 8 was responded to by a large number of candidates. The focus was on the causes of the Wall Street Crash in 1929. Successful answers were able to examine overconfidence and the impact of speculation in some detail and include some valid other factors to provide balance. Other responses showed some confusion around these concepts and focused on the consequences of the Crash or even the causes of the Boom. There was also confusion over economic factors, with some candidates demonstrating a limited understanding of terms like 'on the margin' and 'hire purchase'.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

There were too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study F: South Africa, c. 1940–c. 1994

There were too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were a number of responses to this Depth Study. **Question 13** had a lower number of responses than **Question 14.**

The focus of **Question 13** was on what factors shaped events in Palestine up to 1948. Successful responses examined the role of the USA well and then compared this to other factors such as the role of Britain, the role of Arab nations and the actions of Hebrew movements. Good detail was provided in places, although some wrongly asserted that the USA was sending weapons to Israel before 1948. On the whole, candidates were well focused on the period of the question.

Question 14 had a focus on the failure of the peace process. Successful answers understood this focus and were able to describe why attempts at creating peace, such as the Oslo Accords, were unsuccessful. Some demonstrated a good knowledge of changes in government within Israel and the impact of this on the peace

© 2019

process, as well as writing about Lebanon and the Intifadas. Less successful candidates would have benefited from a greater understanding of the term ‘peace process’; these candidates tended to provide a narrative of events in Palestine and Israel as far back as 1948. This period was before there were any attempts at a peace process. These answers concentrated generally on why the two sides continued to fight, instead of why attempts at peace failed.

© 2019